REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of May 27, 2008 (Office Action). As this action is timely filed within the three-month shortened statutory period, no fees are believed due. However, the Office is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account 50-0951.

Claims Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21-24, and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,860,064 to Henton (hereinafter Henton), in view of U.S. Patent 7,191,131 to Nagao (hereinafter Nagao) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,081,774 to de Hita, *et al* (hereinafter de Hita) and U.S. Patent 6,549,883 to Fabiani, *et a.* (hereinafter Fabiani). Claims 7, 16, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henton in view of de Hita, Nagao, and Fabiani, and in further view of U.S. Patent 7,103,548 to Squibbs, *et al.* (hereinafter Squibbs).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections and thus have not amended the claims. Applicants have cancelled Claims 10-27. However, Applicants are not conceding that the cancelled claims fail to present patentable subject. The cancellation is solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution. Accordingly, the cancellations should not be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter, and Applicants expressly reserve the right to present the original version of any of the cancelled claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 1, is a method for automatically marking a document to be read by a text-to-speech reader with voice type identifiers.

The method can include identifying two or more voice types available to the text-to-speech reader, and identifying text elements within the document. Each voice type can have a corresponding voice type identifier. Identifying text elements, more particularly, can comprise marking gross structural subdivisions of text with a first set of sequenced tags, marking individual paragraphs of the text with a second set of sequenced tags, and marking text elements with a third set of sequenced tags to generate a hierarchical tree identifying the text elements. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0021], lines 1-9.)

The method further can include grouping similar text elements together. The step of grouping similar text elements can include generating one or more clusters according to each identifiable topic of the document. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0022], lines 1-3, and paragraph [0029], lines 1-7.) Additionally, the step of grouping can include syntactically parsing the document and subsequently performing text mining to determine which text elements in the document are similar. More particularly, similarity can be determined based upon lexical affinities among the text elements. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0034], lines 1-3.). The method also can include classifying the grouped text elements according to voice types available to the text-to-speech reader. (See e.g., Specification, paragraph [0020], lines 3-4.).

Additionally, the method can include marking the classified grouped text elements within the document with corresponding voice type identifiers. (See e.g., Specification, paragraph [0020], lines 4-6.)

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

It was stated in the second paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action that Henton does not teach identifying text element, grouping similar text, and classifying the text elements according to voice types available. Applicants believe that Henton also does not teach automatically marking a document to be read by a text-to-speech reader with voice type identifiers based on the classification.

It was asserted in the fourth paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action that de Hita teaches grouping similar text elements together by generating clusters and performing text mining. However, it is noted that de Hita discloses a natural language information retrieval system in which the natural language query is morphologically, syntactically and linguistically analyzed to generate one or more query keywords representing the natural language query. Clearly, de Hita does not disclose grouping similar text elements together for the purpose of being classified against voice type characteristics, but rather only discloses analyzing a natural language query to generate query keyword(s) for searching purpose. Also, de Hita does not disclose automatically marking a document to be read by a text-to-speech reader with voice type identifiers.

It was asserted in the first paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action that Nagao discloses identifying text elements and classifying the text elements according to voice type characteristics. However, it is noted that instead of classifying the grouped text elements against voice type characteristics in order to add voice type identifiers (tags) to the document, Nagao discloses an electronic document processing apparatus that reads out a document that is already tagged. It is also noted that Nagao also does not disclose automatically marking a document to be read by a text-to-speech reader with voice type identifiers based on the classification.

It was asserted in the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action that Fabiani discloses that a text document (transcript) is automatically marked with corresponding voice type identifiers and further grouped (divided into pools) and marked according to the voice type identifiers. However, it is noted that Fabiani discloses a method and apparatus for generating multilingual transcriptions for use in speech recognition systems. A transcription is a representation of the pronunciation of the associated vocabulary item when uttered by a human (col. 1, lines 34-36). Therefore, a transcription is not a text document in the sense of the present invention. The purpose of Fabiani is to reduce unnecessary transcriptions (thus saving memory space) by

eliminating transcriptions in certain languages that are unlikely to be used. For example, a transcription in Russian for the vocabulary item "Robert" can be eliminated because "Robert" is an uncommon name in Russian. Clearly, Fabiani has nothing to do with the present invention. More particularly, Fabiani does not disclose automatically marking a document to be read by a text-to-speech reader with voice type identifiers based on the classification, as recited in Claim 1 of the instant application.

Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 1 defines over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance. Allowance of the application, accordingly, is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Response, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 8, 2008

/Richard A. Hinson/

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000